

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

### Status of the Claims

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12, 14-17, 21, 23, and 24 have been rejected. Claims 3, 9-11, 13, 18-20, and 22 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24 are currently amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 14 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3, 9-11, 13, 18-20, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and intervening claim 2. Allowable claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim 4. Allowable claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim 14. Independent claim 24 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of rewritten claim 3. Thus, Applicant requests the allowance of independent claims 3, 11, 20, and 24.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 7, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0099285 of Graziano et al. (“Graziano”) in view of “Application to locally optimum detection of a new noise model,” Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1996 of Tesei et al. (“Tesei”).

The rejection of claims 4 and 14 is moot because claims 4 and 14 have been currently canceled.

It is submitted that claims 7 and 17 are not rendered obvious by Graziano in view of Tesei under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) given that claims 7 and 17 depend from and include the limitations of one of the corresponding independent claims 11 and 20 noted above.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graziano in view of Tesei and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,768,473 of Eatwell et al.

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 is moot because claims 1 and 2 have been currently canceled.

It is submitted that claims 5, 6, 15, and 16 are not rendered obvious by Graziano in view of Tesei and further in view of Eatwell under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) given that claims 5, 6, 15, and 16 depend from and include the limitations of one of the corresponding independent claims 11 and 20 noted above.

It is submitted that claim 24 is not rendered obvious by Graziano in view of Tesei and further in view of Eatwell under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) given that claim 24, as amended, includes limitations similar to the limitations of claim 3 as discussed above.

Claims 8 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graziano in view of Tesei and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0156441 of Peeters et al. ("Peeters").

It is submitted that claims 8 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Graziano in view of Tesei and further in view of Peeters under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) given that claims 8 and 23 depend from and include the limitations of one of the corresponding independent claims 11 and 20 noted above.

Claims 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graziano in view of Tesei, Eatwell, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0047514 of Bolin et al. ("Bolin").

It is submitted that claims 12 and 21 are not rendered obvious by Graziano in view of Tesei, Eatwell and further in view of Bolin under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) given that claims 12 and 21 depend from and include the limitations of one of the corresponding independent claims 11 and 20 noted above.

## CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the application of the doctrine of equivalents. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: January 14, 2008

/Jeremy A. Schweigert/  
Jeremy A. Schweigert  
Reg. No. 56,244  
Tel.:(408) 720-8300

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040